



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/277,356	03/26/1999	BYOUNG KU KIM	8733D.6965	3421

30827 7590 03/01/2007
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

TON, MINH TOAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32 and 35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5835139. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both comprise common and overlapping subject matter.

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32 and 35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-65 of U.S. Patent No. 5926237. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both comprise common and overlapping subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32 and 35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6373537. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both comprise common and overlapping subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 20, 29-32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanori (JP 07-099394).

Masanori discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising: a liquid crystal panel 2 including a display area; first and second frames coupled to sides and edges of the liquid crystal panel; an outer casing disposed on the liquid crystal panel; the edges including a plurality of mounting holes, wherein the holes receives fastening screws.

Art Unit: 2871

Fastening means such as unthreaded fasteners, screws are common and known in the art. Further, the employment such as fastening means such as brackets would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for yielding advantages such as improved-securing means so as housing elements within the display device are tightly-secured. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ fastening means such as brackets for yielding advantages such as improved-securing means so as housing elements within the display device are tightly-secured.

Masanori shows the holes of the casing aligned with the mounting holes.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/03/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

US Pat No. 5835139, 5926237 and 6373537 recite in the claims common and overlapping subject matter as to the present claimed invention. The claimed invention comprises subject matter that is not patentably distinct from the patents (w/ the common assignee).

Masanori discloses the claimed invention except for the use of particular fastening means, however, fastening means such as unthreaded fasteners, screws are common and known in the art. Further, the employment such as fastening means such as brackets would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for yielding advantages such as improved-securing means so as housing elements within the display device

Art Unit: 2871

are tightly-secured. It is noted both (the present claimed) invention and Masanori disclose side-mounting display devices employing various fastening means.

Masanori shows the holes of the casing aligned with the mounting holes.

Conclusion

4. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/277356. *All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application* and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2871

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 27, 2007


TOAN TON
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER